

stus2018 to me

1 May

Dear Velislava,

We are delighted to inform you that your submission has been accepted for presentation as a talk at the ESSLLI Student Session, August 6-17th, 2018 in Sofia, Bulgaria.

In order to present at the Student Session, you will have to register for ESSLLI. Please register for ESSLLI as soon as possible at the following site: <http://esslli2018.folli.info/registration/>

We also require that all presenters work out an extended version of their submissions, which we will then include in our online proceedings. The extended version has to be submitted to us the latest on *July 2nd* (there will be no extension!). We kindly ask you to make sure to incorporate the suggestions of your reviewers into your extended paper and consider their criticism carefully. We strongly believe that this will help your work to become even better.

We only accept extended versions that use the LNCS Springer class files for LaTeX2e, obtainable from <ftp://ftp.springer.de/pub/tex/latex/lncs/latex2e/lncs2e.zip>

The extended version of your submission may fill at most 12 pages (including references, appendix etc.) and the format should be Din-A4. Please prepare a folder containing a pdf version of your extended submission, the LaTeX source file, your .bib file and any other files that we may need to compile your document. Before *July 2nd*, send this folder to ALL of the following e-mail addresses:

jen.sikos@ims.uni-stuttgart.de

martin@cis.lmu.de

c.m.van.son@vu.nl

Finally, if you have any questions pertaining to the Student Session, your presentation or the extended version of your submission, please do not hesitate to ask us. You can reach us using the same e-mail addresses to which you will submit your extended version.

Congratulations again! We are looking forward to meeting you at ESSLLI,

Jennifer Sikos, Martin Schmitt and Chantal van Son
Chairs of the Language & Computation track, ESSLLI 2018 Student Session

----- REVIEW 1 -----

PAPER: 24

TITLE: Playing with Information Source

AUTHORS: Velislava Todorova

Overall evaluation: 2 (accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

The paper attempts to tackle the phenomenon of evidentiality by presenting a simulation program that models linguistic behavior with a focus on information source indication. It is taken that languages with an obligatory information source marking have already developed an evidential system. The simulation scenario is based on the idea that information source needs to be indicated when this is relevant for the reliability of the information itself. In the proposed stimulation scenario misunderstanding is used as a technique to introduce unreliability.

The paper proposes a fresh view to evidentiality by providing a gaming stimulation scenario and I would like to see it accepted.

----- Positive Feedback -----

The structure of the simulation and the game are explained well enough that the reader can follow the scenario. The visualization is also well explained so that the reader can easily understand the examples given.

----- Paper Weaknesses -----

I would have liked a longer discussion on the conclusions of the simulation and what we can draw out of it in respect to evidentiality.

----- REVIEW 2 -----

PAPER: 24

TITLE: Playing with Information Source

AUTHORS: Velislava Todorova

Overall evaluation: 1 (weak accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

This paper presents a simulation game that models linguistic behaviour with respect to markers of Information Source. It is well written and the game is very well explained with lots of detail and the paper is interesting to read.

What I am missing, however, is a more precise description of what exactly the authors want to learn. The authors say that they "hope the game helps to understand some of the issues related to evidentially". I think it would be interesting if they add a section about

- which issues might be learned

- and how exactly that might be learned from this game

It is particularly important because results are not yet very well elaborated , and only in relation to the game, not in relation what can be learnt with respect to the linguistic phenomenon of evidentiality.

Anyway I liked reading the paper and my critics may be coloured by the fact that I do not know much about game theory.

----- Positive Feedback -----

(see overall evaluation) It is well written , interesting topic and interesting to read.

----- Paper Weaknesses -----

(see overall evaluation) It would help if the introduction gives more background information

-about information source and evidentiality and
-about how these games can contribute to linguistic theory

----- REVIEW 3 -----

PAPER: 24

TITLE: Playing with Information Source

AUTHORS: Velislava Todorova

Overall evaluation: 2 (accept)

----- Overall evaluation -----

This paper's aim is to simulate the development of information source marking strategies in a virtual setting. A program has been developed in which users can enter parameters about a virtual population of individuals: the number of individuals and their reliability. The results show that depending on these parameters, different information source marking strategies can be developed.

I find it impressive that the paper can present a working framework and I find it positive that the author put in a lot of effort to visualize the results of the simulations.

Actually all my remarks on this work come down to one single point of critique:

For a conference, such as the student session of ESSLLI, it is important that the author can explain their work to people from other domains in linguistics. I find that the present work lacks motivation and that it takes for granted that the reader is aware of the meaning of a lot of jargon.

I will point out a number of points in the text, that I think should be clarified:

- The title: I think it is necessary to put a title that says more clearly what you are doing, for example: Simulating how speakers develop strategies to mark information source.
- Introduction (page 1): I think that this part needs more examples of how information source can be marked in languages and what its role is in languages that do mark information source.
- Introduction (page 1): What is the goal of your study, which questions do you try to answer, or what hypothesis are you testing? What is the theoretical motivation of your work and what can we learn from it?
- Introduction (page 1): can you give examples of misunderstanding of insincerity?
- 2 Structure of the Simulation (page 1): what is the motivation of setting the misunderstanding parameter to 50%?
- 3 The Game (page 2): What do you mean by Nature?
- 3 The Game (page 2): Maybe you can refer to Player 1 and Player 2 with the neutral pronoun 'they' instead of 'he'.
- 3 The Game (page 3): The figure needs a caption that explains what we can see in it (it is written in the text somewhere, but it would be nice to explain under the figure how we should read it).
- 3 The Game (page 4): Table 2 gives cost and gains for different situations. But how did you determine the cost and gain parameters? What is the motivation?
- 4 Learning Mechanism (page 5): You talk about the Polya urns, but you do not explain how it works. Could you explain more?

- 5 Visualization (page 6): You talk about turtles. I don't have a clue what it has to do with a turtle. I think that it is important to be able to explain your program while not getting into the details of the exact implementation of the framework you choose (NetLogo), your explanation should be self-containing.
- 6 Examples (page 7): What do you mean with 'pure strategy'?
- 6 Examples (page 7): Could you give more explanation about how to read the plots?
- 7 Conclusion and Future Work (page 8): Could so say something about the linguistic relevance of your work?

----- Positive Feedback -----

I find it impressive that the paper can present a working framework and I find it positive that the author put in a lot of effort to visualize the results of the simulations.

----- Paper Weaknesses -----

The paper needs to be clarified on many points.